EACHING

THE

atin Tongue

BY

USE,

those that have already Learn'd
their MOTHER-TONGUE.

In way of Dialogue.

LONDON,

ted for *Noth. Ponder* at the *Peacock*
in the *Poultry*. 1685.

DIALOGUE I.

The Way of Teaching Latine by Uſe.

A. B.

A. I Have been lately reading over a little Book bearing this Title, *An Examen of the Way of Teaching the Latine Tongue to little Children by uſe alone*, Engliſhed out of *French* Printed 1669. ſome years ſince, and Printed by the Printers to the R. Society; and therefore (I may preſume) by their Order. The occaſion of the firſt writing of it in *French*, was the great exactneſs and readineſs of a Child, that had been taught from the Cradle. The Author ſufficiently ſhews the Advantages of that way of Teaching, beyond the common Methods. But ſeeing (as he himſelf conceives) it is not like to be generally put in practice; I was thinking, that another thing might be well worth our conſideration

(which he doth but just mention) namely The Teaching of the Latine Tongue by Use, to such as have Learn'd their Mother-Tongue before. "This he conceives no "otherwise to be done, but by put-
Exam. p. 32,33. "ting together many men Able in "that Language, who should make "as 'twere a little Latine Republick, which "may be easily done (saith he) if the King "[of *France*] who hath done so many great "and difficult things, would think fit to Issue "his Orders for it. I had seen before a Book with this Title, *Directorium Studii Linguarum Politicum*; wherein that nameless Author undertakes to Model Glottick Societies; but supposeth it a thing not to be done, without the Aid and Encouragement of Princes. *Eilhardus Lubinus* also had some such Project, it seems, in an Epistle of his to the Duke of *Stetein*, *Anno* 1614. But seeing there is so slender hope of any such Encouragement, methinks it is still worth Enquiry, whether there may not be such a Model of a School, where it may be Learn'd by Use, and that at such a charge, as may not be very burdensom to Parents. Now mentioning this matter to some of mine Acquaintance, I find that they generally doubt of the practicableness of the thing, but upon a different ground. Some conceive that the Latine Tongue may

be

be Learn'd by Uſe, but that it would require an intolerable charge, to maintain ſo many Teachers and Servants, and to provide other things neceſſary to ſuch an Undertaking. Others apprehend again, that it may be done at a Charge not unſupportable, but that the Latine Tongue cannot be Learn'd by Uſe to any Compleatneſs. After all, I had a great deſire to have ſome diſcourſe with you; becauſe I think I have heard you ſay, that you are perſuaded, both upon conſideration of the Reaſon of the thing, and upon ſome Experience alſo, that Learning by Uſe is a thing practicable, and alſo that it may be done at a tolerable Charge.

B. That the Latine Tongue may be Learn'd by Uſe, as other Tongues are, and as it was Learn'd when it was a National Language, there is no queſtion. But I ſuppoſe the meaning of your Enquiry is, whether it may be ſo Learn'd by Uſe, (being now not National) as to be uſeful and ready to all purpoſes, both of familiar, and more ſolemn & ſet Diſcourſe, either in Speaking, or Writing, to the underſtanding of what we Read; and (in ſhort) to all purpoſes of a Language.

A. Yes, I mean nothing leſs. Though indeed I chiefly had regard to familiar Speaking, ſuppoſing, that that being gotten by uſe, it would be no hard thing ſo to order

it, that all the reſt would eaſily follow.

B. In anſwer to the former of your Enquiries, I ſay, that a School may be ſo Ordered, that the Latine Tongue may be Taught by Uſe, to thoſe that have Learn'd their Mother-Tongue before, of what Age ſoever they be, (within the compaſs of thoſe years, that any uſe to apply themſelves to the Learning of a Language) and that to ſuch perfection as we have been ſpeaking of. To the other I ſay, that I verily conceive, it may be done without ſuch Chargeable Models, as thoſe Authors, which you named, ſpeak of: Though I do not ſay, I can determine, what the charge muſt neceſſarily be. But when I have firſt deſcribed to you the manner of Teaching by Uſe, it will be eaſy to compute the Charge.

A. Well, proceed your own way.

B. A certain Number of Boys or Lads, being in Company with a Maſter (or it may be, more) who will continually Speak Latine in their hearing, will learn to Speak, as they hear their Maſter Speak, as certainly as a Child Learns his Mother-Tongue, of his Nurſe, and the reſt of the Family.

A. I doubt the Iſſue would not be the ſame.

B. We have daily experience, that there is little or no difference, between the Learning

ing of our Mother-Tongue, and of a forreign Speech by Travel: Now it may be ſo ordered, that the Learner may have all the advantages in a School, that a Traveller hath of Learning a Forreign Tongue.

A. That there is no great difference, between Learning of our Native Speech from Infancy, and of another Tongue at 9 or 10 years of Age, in a Forreign Country, I think I may grant; For it is ſaid of *Tom. Coriat*, that when he had been a Month or two in *India*, he could ſcold in the *Indoſtan* Language, with any Fap-mouth Quean of that Country. And I think a Boy is more apt to learn to talk, than a man. But that a Scholar in any School (howſoever modelled or managed) can have the advantages that a Traveller hath, I cannot readily conceive. For in a School he hath but one or few Maſters: But in a Forreign Country he Learns of every one, he hears ſpeak, and ſo hath 1000 Teachers.

B. Though being abroad, he converſes among 10000 that Speak the Language, he is to learn; yet he can give ear to no more than one at once. And therefore if there be One or Two continually Speaking with him, or in his hearing; he hath the ſame advantage of Learning to Speak, as if he converſed in the Roman *Forum*.

A. Roman *Forum*! *Album Græcum.* Suppoſe there be 20, or but 10 Boys, who can all ſpeak Engliſh as faſt as the Maſter can ſpeak Latine; how ſhall a Maſter or two out-talk them all?

B. It is not to be ſuppoſed, that this School muſt conſiſt of any great Number in the very firſt beginning. And the buſineſs may be ſo managed with a ſmall Number; that they may Learn in ſilence of their Maſter; he knowing how to ſpeak ſo, as may beſt ſuit with their humours and weak capacities. Neither will there be need of any long Pythagorean Silence. For in a very ſhort time they will have gotten Latine enough to ſpeak ſo much of their ordinary conceptions as to take away all tedioufneſs. And ſoon after the Number may be augmented, and the firſt company, being by their talk as ſo many Teachers to the new comers: They will Learn both of the Maſter and of them; and that with great pleaſure. For hearing their Companions Speak briskly (and as 'twere naturally) about them; they are ſo greatly concern'd to know what is talkt of, that they are as eager to Learn, as the others are to Speak. For though they care not a ſtraw, to know the words that the others uſe; yet the earneſt deſire they have to know what is

ſpoken

ſpoken of, brings them inſenſibly & unawares to the knowledge of the Tongue it ſelf.

A. A very good account you give (which before I did not conſider) of any one's Learning better by diſcourſe than by Book.

B. This is the very Reaſon why even Children and Idiots learn to ſpeak by hearing others, better than men of Reaſon and Parts, with much pains, [redacted] by the help of Books only. Nay, a man that hath a purpoſe to learn a Language, and hath the diſcretion to ask at every turn, how this, and that, and th'other may be ſpoken, and hath no farther familiar Talk, cannot learn ſo ſoon, nor ſo well, as a Boy converſing amongſt lively Talkers; becauſe of the earneſt deſire he hath (as every one cannot but have) of knowing what is talked of. Such a natural and irreſiſtible longing is there in every one to know what is ſpoken to him, or of him, or of his concerns, or any thing, or perſon preſent, or any action or deſign juſt now in hand. Hence 'tis that ſuch as have dwelt in the ſame houſe, where Latin hath been familiarly uſed, though they have had no deſign to learn, yet have learned to ſpeak, becauſe they had not patience to be ignorant of what others ſaid in their hearing. This deſire I ſay is irreſiſtible and unextinguiſhable, being grounded on that natural deſire

of Knowing, which is in every creature wherein there is but the leaſt ſhadow of Reaſon, and alſo on the Curioſity that there is in every one, which makes us more inquiſitive into things near and preſent, than we are into matters of infinitely greater moment, if diſtant from us, for time and place.

A. This muſt needs make them learn.

B. You know the Old Woman was deeply affected, when one told her the diſmal ſtory of St. *Lawrence*'s being broiled alive upon a Grid-Iron; it put her into ſuch dumps, that ſhe had like to have ſpilt her Drink, thinking it was ſomething done at *Bedford*, or thereabouts near home, laſt week. But at laſt bethinking her ſelf, ſhe askt when it was done, and where: But hearing it was done above a thouſand years ago, and a thouſand miles off, ſhe was on a ſudden very merry, and took off her Cup, and ſaid, it was but a ſtory. So little was ſhe concern'd in ſuch a diſtant affair. But then falling to talk of her Ducks and her Neighbours, her Clapper could never lie ſtill. So the preſent buſineſs is that which ſets the Boys a talking. A new Comer being in company with four or five Latine Talkers, that are Partners in a Bird's Neſt, perceiving how faſt their Tongues wag, though he cannot ſpeak three words of Latine, yet he hath a mighty mind

to

to know what's the matter, and ſo he thruſts into the midſt of them with both Elbows, crying, *Quid? Quid? Quid?* They will not tell him, being minded to keep to themſelves a thing of ſo great concernment. But he is reſolv'd he will know; for he perceives by their briskneſs, that it is ſome brave thing: Away he runs after them, and ſeeing what's the buſineſs, begins with no ſmall pleaſure to mingle talk with them.

A. It ſeems, that whereas the Maſter is ſometimes forced to beat a Boy, to make him learn by his Book; there is hardly any beating of him from learning this way.

B. I ſay ſo much of this matter, becauſe it hence appears clearly, what an advantage there is in learning to ſpeak this way, above the other Dead way by Book only.

A. But they'l ſay, All this is but twattle; to learn by his Grammar and other Books, is in many other reſpects better, though not ſo ſportful a way.

B. Books are their buſineſs, as you will hear by and by. I am only telling you now how pleaſantly they learn by Talk, ſo far as concerns ſpeaking Latine familiarly.

A. But there are Books made for this very purpoſe, to teach them to ſpeak familiarly.

B. I have already given you the Reaſon, why this readineſs is gotten better thus, than

than by any Books, though contriv'd for that very uſe; ſuch as Colloquies, familiar Forms, Collections of Idiotiſms, and the like. If it could be ſuppoſed, that theſe young Learners could get a ſufficient number of Words, and familiar Phraſes, and Forms into their memories, by help of their Books (which they can hardly be thought able to do) all this would not make them ready at ſpeaking; becauſe to the gaining of ſuch a promptitude, 'tis not only requiſite that they have ſuch Words and Formula's in their Memories, but in their Fancy alſo, that they may come of themſelves to their Tongues end, without thinking of them, or ſtudying for them. Now this having of it upon their Fancy, ſo as to ſpeak without thinking how, is not gotten by Books, without very great labour, and much reading of ſuch kind of Books, with more exerciſe of thoughts than we can conceive theſe young ones (or almoſt any body elſe) will put themſelves to. But continual familiar Talk, will bring them eaſily and inſenſibly to it. As for thoſe Linguiſts that maintain, that this familiar Readineſs may be atttain'd as eaſily by Books as by Converſe, I will yield to them, when I hear them ſpeak Greek more readily than their Mother-Tongue: For they have taken more

more pains at the Book to learn Greek, than they have done to learn Engliſh.

A. Though they may get this Readineſs, by hearing and talking with thoſe that are ready, yet they will have occaſion to converſe with ſome others, beſides their Maſter and School-fellows, unleſs there be a ſlaviſh reſtraint laid upon them. Now, will not this neceſſity of converſing ſometimes with others in their Native Tongue, be an occaſion of corrupting their Latine?

B. It is no way convenient indeed, that they ſhould converſe careleſly with all they meet in a populous place; neither is it any ſlavery to reſtrain them from ſo doing; and ſo much converſe with others as is neceſſary, as (ſuppoſe) to ſpeak to the Servants of the Family in Engliſh for what they want, or the like, is no impediment. For it is not the hearing of Engliſh now and then, that corrupts their Latine, or the ſpeaking of Engliſh now and then that hinders it, if it be only with thoſe with whom they have ſeldom converſe. But that which muſt be mainly heeded, is, that they may not get a habit of Speaking Engliſh to one another, and that they may not hear Latine corruptly ſpoken. I have known a Child Speak Latine properly enough with his Father, who was wont to Speak Latine with

with him in his Infancy: Who yet always uſed to Speak Engliſh with his Mother. And both Tongues were equally Familiar with him, without corrupting of each other.

A. If new Comers ſhould over-number the ready ſpeakers; they would not only not Learn themſelves, but corrupt the purity of the others Speech.

B. This danger will eaſily be prevented, if ſuch as are newly admitted, be ſufficiently mingled amongſt the others, in their Leſſons or in their places; that it may not be eaſy for them, to Herd by themſelves from the reſt, or drive on the ſame deſigns together by themſelves (for they are ſeldom without ſome project or other in their heads, beſides, their Leſſon.) If ſuch conſorting by themſelves apart from the reſt, be freely permitted, they will be little concern'd to mind how the others ſpeak. As Six or Seven Engliſhmen, being familiarly acquainted, may live in *France* together, and not learn *French*, if they pleaſe. But if theſe new come boys be diſperſed among others; as they will not have provocation, ſo neither will they have Confidence to ſpeak *Engliſh*; eſpecially all being prepoſſeſſed with ſuch principles, that it is not only contumacy againſt the Maſter, but alſo an Ungentiel and Diſgraceful thing to ſpeak *Engliſh*, among thoſe that ſpeak Latine.

A.

A. Will not Barbariſms and a corrupt way of ſpeaking creep in?

B. Let the Teacher but obſerve the way preſcribed, and be careful to frame his talk ſo, that he may fill them with ſuch words and Idioms, as beſt fit the things they love to talk of, and their *Copia* of words grows up inſenſibly afterwards by hearing continual Talk, as a Snow-ball grows bigger, by continual rolling. And being thus furniſhed with Words, and Phraſes, they cannot without trouble deviſe ſuch Angliciſms, as young Latiniſts, that Learn the other way, do ordinarily fall into. Even when they begin to ſpeak, before they are acquainted with Grammar Rules, they are far leſs apt to ſpeak either Incongruouſly or Improperly, than many accurate Grammarians, who have not been uſed to Familiar Talk.

A. Strange, that it ſhould be ſo.

B. He that ſpeaks fluently as ſome call it only thinks of the ſenſe, not the words. And he that thinks of his words (much more, if he muſt think of the Grammar of them) will ſpeak but very heſitantly. Whereas he that learns by Uſe, may ſpeak fluently and Grammatically, before he underſtands, or is capable of underſtanding Grammar. And afterwards, when he underſtands Rules, he cannot ſpeak more or leſs readily.

readily. For Grammar Rules are neither a furtherance nor a Hindrance in this matter of true and ready ſpeaking, tho uſeful to other purpoſes. I have known all the Scholars in a School, as well the younger ones, as the better Grammarians, ſpeak Latine properly and readily, not only with their Maſter, but with one another, in all their ſports, as well as in their School buſineſs; neither indeed could they frame their mouths to ſpeak *Engliſh* with thoſe, with whom they were wont to ſpeak Latine. Nay in their little Quarrels (ſuch as uſe ſometimes to happen) or in their moſt tranſporting paſſions of Joy or Anger, not a word of *Engliſh* would break out; their Latine being more ready.

A. If Familiar ſpeaking will bring them to this confirmed Habit: This way in my judgment is not inferiour to that other of Teaching from Infancy.

B. I queſtion not but it is equal to that. But indeed, if after this beginning, there be not alſo adue Management in the following conduct; neither this way, nor that from Infancy, will be of any great uſe to them.

A. No? I ſhould think that when they have gotten a Habit of ſpeaking truly and readily, the worſt is over. I thought indeed that they could not have been brought to

thi

this congruous and ready ſpeaking without Grammar Rules. But ſeeing (as you affirm) they ſpeak not only Grammatically but properly alſo, and that with ſuch Habitual Readineſs, there is no great matter remains to be done. For firſt, there can be no need at all of Grammar, which is the Art of Right Speaking, becauſe they ſpeak true without it. And as for other matters, how can there be any thing of Difficulty or Hazard, ſeeing they may eaſily (I think) be brought to write as they ſpeak, that is, congruouſly and properly? And then 'tis no hard matter to lead them on to Variation, and ſuch kind of Exerciſes as tend to the bettering of their Style: Though I know ſuch things uſe to be after Grammar.

B. You have anſwered your ſelf in making your Objection; and I think you have ſaid more than you are aware of. To keep due Order in that which is immediately to follow after, or rather accompany this promptitude of Speaking, is a principal thing to be obſerv'd: And you have hinted what is next to be done, namely, to bring them to write as they ſpeak. This (as you ſay rightly) is not hard to be done. But if this be hudled over careleſly, or if they be poſted on too haſtily to Grammar Subtilties, no ſmall inconveniencies may follow:

But

But that we may the better discern how to proceed with them next, the best way is to observe the *Romans* Method with their Children, from their first beginning until they were taught Grammar.

A. Can their way be clearly known?

B. *Quintilian* tells us, that their Children either first learned their Mother-Latine of their Nurses, and others about them, and afterwards were taught Greek by Use; or else (where there was more care taken) * they had such Nurses and Attendants about them, as taught them the Greek Tongue first; which having taken some firm Root, they were permitted to learn their National Tongue: And after they had gotten the familiar use both of Greek and Latine, they were taught to Read and Write. This was accounted to belong not to *Grammatice* or Grammar but to *Grammatistice*, as the Ancients distinguish †. After Reading and Writing they were taught the Grammar of both Tongues, which they could

* *A Sermone Græco pueros incipere malo; quia Latinus, qui pluribus in usu est, vel nobis nolentibus se perbibet; non tamen hoc adeo superstitiosè velim fieri, ut diu tantum loquatur græcè, aut discat, sicut plerisque moris est, &c.*

Non longè itaque Latina subsequi debent, & citò pariterque ire.

Ita fiet ut quum æquali curâ linguam utramq; experimus, neutra alteri officiat. Quintil. lib. 1. cap. 1.

† *Primus in eo qui legendi scribendique*

ould already Speak, and Read, and Write. Indeed he akes Grammar there in a arger ſignification, than it s ordinarily taken with us. But that which he there makes the firſt part of Grammar, is that which we ordinarily call Grammar, *viz.* the Art of Right Speaking; with which he would have Children to begin. Upon all this way of theirs with their Children, I make this threefold Reflection. Firſt, If it was not an Errour in them to learn the Greek Tongue by Uſe (whether it were before or after the Latine) before they taught them Grammar, then it cannot be an Errour in us, to teach our Children Latine by Uſe (whether before or after Engliſh) before we teach them Grammar. Secondly, As neceſſary as it was for them to learn the Grammar of both the Greek and Latine Tongues, having firſt learned both Tongues by the Ear and Uſe; ſo neceſſary, and no more is it, and upon the ſame Reaſon, that our Children ſhould learn the Grammar both of the Latine and Engliſh Tongues, having learned them both before,

adeptus erit facultatem, Grammaticis eſt locus; nec refert de Græco an de Latino loquar; quanquam Græcum eſſe priorem placet; utriq; eadem eſt via. Qu. l. c. 4.

Hæc igitur profeſſio cùm breviſſimè in duas partes dividitur, rectè loquendi ſcientiam, & Poetarum enarrationem, &c. Ibid.

fore by Uſe. But Thirdly, (which is cloſeſt to the matter in hand) they did not begin to teach their Children the Grammar, either of the Latine or Greek Tongues, until they had gotten *Scribendi Facultatem* a Faculty, that is, an Ability or Readineſs of Writing: So neither ſhould we teach them the Grammar either of the Engliſh or the Latine Tongue, until they have gotten an Ability or Faculty of Writing both in Engliſh and Latine. Now here we are to obſerve what this *Scribendi Facultas* meaneth. Doubtleſs there is more meant by it than meerly the making of Letters, or writing after a Copy; for that cannot be *Scribendi Facultas*, an Ability and Readineſs of Writing, no more than the knowing of the Letters of the Alphabet is *Legendi Facultas*, an Ability of Reading. It muſt ſignifie at leaſt, the knowing how to write down any word, phraſe, or ſentence, that he himſelf ſhould think on, or ſhould be dictated to him, no body telling him with what Letters it ſhould be ſpelled, and without looking into a Book to ſee the ſpelling. *Scribendi Facultas* can ſignifie no leſs than all this. If then we will teach our Children, as they did theirs, the Scholar having firſt learned by Uſe to ſpeak Latine, muſt have gotten alſo a Readineſs of Writing any

word

word or ſentence, either Engliſh or Latine, which he thinks on himſelf, or is dictated to him, or ſounded in his hearing; and all this before his Head ſhould be buſied about Grammar Subtilties.

It appears then, that as the *Roman* Children did, ſo thoſe will write true Latine, before they learn Grammar. For he that can ſpeak true, and can but write down what he thinks or ſpeaks, that is, (in plain Engliſh) if he can ſpell right, it will be true Latine. And if he can ſpeak right, and yet doth not write true, it is for want of ability of right ſpelling. So that, before he be put to Grammar (according to *Fabius*) he is to be exerciſed, until he can write true Latine, or, (which is all one) until he can ſpell right. For to him that ſpeaks true, ſpelling aright, and writing true, is one and the ſame thing, when he writes what he ſpeaks. Now you ſee what they are next to be taught after they have learn'd to ſpeak; that is, to be able to write down whatever they can ſpeak, or whatever is dictated to them.

A. I do ſee it plainly. And I ſee withal that there is no need of Learning of Grammar, to get a faculty of true writing, if they ſpeak True Latine. But is it not to be feared, that they will not ſpeak True by

Uſe, and ſo conſequently that their writing will be faulty as their Speech ?

B. Now you bring me back again to that which I have ſpoken of amply, and (as you acknowledged) ſatisfyingly before; which is not neceſſary to be repeated. But however, if there can be any defect, either in their Speech or Writing, there remains ſtill a Remedy, that is, Grammar. Though indeed, if that due and orderly conduct already ſpoken of, be obſerv'd; there can hardly be any need of Grammar, to the attaining an Ability of true Speaking, or true Writing, as I have ſhew'd And all this belonged to Grammatiſtice, as they call'd it, which went before Grammar, and made way to it.

A. If Grammar be not needful to thoſe ends mentioned, I ſee not to what purpoſe it ſerves; but that which you call Grammatiſtice may ſuffice without it: As in our Mother-Tongue, he who can write true Engliſh, as he ſpeaks; doth not think it needful to Learn the Grammar of the Engliſh Tongue.

B. The Romans (you ſee) accounted Grammar needful. Now as they led their Children to the knowledge of Grammar, ſo ſoon as they could Speak, and Read, and Write true: So we may ours. But as they, ſo we ſhould do this in a more Orderly, Gradual, Practical and Eaſy way, than is ordinarily in uſe among us.

A.

A. Though I ſee no need of it at al: either in an eaſy or a hard way ; yet becauſe there may be ſome Reaſon for it, which I do not perceive ; and becauſe the Romans, who did ſo, knew why they did it ; you may, (if you pleaſe) deſcribe this eaſy way more diſtinctly.

B. Well then, Having been taught by Uſe, and the Ear, in Speaking ; they may be led on to example, which Example is to them a Rule, until they can conceive of Terms of Grammar Art, and matters abſtract and ſubtile, as the things of Grammar are.

A. I ſee no need of example in a Grammar-Book, much leſs of abſtract Rules and Idea's. Nay I ſee no difference between Uſe, and Example, and Rule. For what they hear, & read, is an Example and a Rule to them; & Teaches them to Speak after the ſame manner ; as you your ſelf have ſhewed. Nay that which they themſelves Speak, is an Example & a Rule to them, and teaches them to Speak ſo again. Now then (ſuppoſing what they hear or ſpeak be Right) what uſe is there of any other Example or Rule in their Book.

B. What they Hear Spoken is an Example, and that Example a Rule ; but a kind of volatile and vaniſhing one. But when out of thoſe thouſands of Examples, which they have in Speaking, or Hearing, or Reading,

one be ſingled out, and put in their Grammar-Book; then they have one fixed and abiding Example, to be an Exemplary Rule. As for the Example offered to their Ear in Talk, though they Imitate it, yet they do ſo, as it were without thinking, or not knowing when they Imitate it, nor taking notice, which is the particular pattern, they follow. But having one in their Book, they can look on it, and think of it, and conſider it, and not only Imitate it, but know which it is, they Imitate.

A. Is that all? Well, granting that it be needful, or but expedient, or that it doth no harm (for that is all, I think, that you can prove) to have an example in their Grammar-Book for Imitation, beſides what they Hear and Read elſewhere; yet what need is there of that which is ordinarily called a Grammar-Rule, being ſomewhat harder to be conceived of, than an Example, and of the ſame uſe, and no more.

B. They learn thoſe more ſubtle things after Uſe and Example, for the better apprehending of the Reaſon both of the Latine Tongue, and of Speech in general. They learn them, I ſay, not to get a Habitual Promptitude of Speaking Right; for that is gotten by hearing others Speak, and by Reading: Nor only that they may know and

and prove that what they ſpeak is true: For this they can do by their Grammar Example, or Exemplary Rule: But that they may know the Reaſon both of their own Speech, and of what they read of in other Books, and of their Grammar-Example it ſelf. This they know by their Grammar-Rule, if it be perfect as it ought to be.

A. You have ſhewed, that if there be any defect in Familiar Uſe, and that the Tongue cannot be ſo gotten to compleatneſs, Grammar will make up the defect at the worſt. But is not this to ſtart from what you undertook to make out? *viz.* that it may be attained by Uſe? Uſe and Grammar after, or with it, is not Uſe alone.

B. I have ſhewed what I went about to ſhew. For this laſt thing we ſpake of, *viz.* Grammar-Rule, abſtracted from Example, is nothing to the getting of a Habit of right Speaking, or true Writing, which are both gotten by Familiar Uſe. Or if we ſuppoſe that that will not do the thing compleatly, yet at the worſt, the Exemplary-Rule ſets all right and compleat. Now this being nothing but ſome particular Inſtance, choſen out of a thouſand other Examples, either Heard, or Read, or Spoken; it is all but Reading, which is

comprehended in Uſe. For this the Author of *Examen* tells us he means by Uſe; and that rightly, for it is ſo. Therefore if one gets not a compleat Habit by both Speaking and Reading of Authors; but hath need alſo of a particular Example to be his Rule; ſtill he learns by Uſe. For if an Example in an Author be but Uſe, then an Example in the Grammar-Book is ſo too. Therefore when he ſpeaks of Uſe alone, he means Uſe excluding only the Abſtract and Subtile things of Grammar. You ſee now, that whether they get compleatneſs by Familiar Speaking, or by Reading Books ſuitable to their Capacity; or whether there be need of ſuperadding the Example in the Grammar-Book; ſtill they learn by Uſe. Though I ſay again, that I do not grant that there is need of Grammar-Example, or but very rarely, but that the Uſe of Familiar Speaking will produce a Habit of ſpeaking true ordinarily. And therefore I often boldly uſe the word Uſe in that ſtrict ſenſe. But if any will contend that the Abſtract Rule, as I called it, is neceſſary to be known, I oppoſe it not. I ſay, it is uſeful to ſuch purpoſe as I have mentioned.

Exam. p. 46. 13.

A. To what purpoſe ſome may think it needful, I know not. But indeed it ſeems to

to me, not to be ſo needful as you make it.

B. I do not make account it is neceſſary to a Habit of Right Speaking. But I ſay, that to what purpoſe ſoever the knowledge of Grammar ſerves, it ought to be taught in this natural, orderly way, and by theſe eaſie ſteps.

A. I eaſily cloſe with you in that.

B. As clear as this ſeems to you, yet it was needful that I ſhould make ſo many words about it, becauſe the ordinary way of Teaching ſuppoſeth the quite contrary; namely, that there is no getting a Habit of true Speaking or Writing, or skill to underſtand an ordinary Book, until they have learned the ſubtile Terms, and Notions, and Rules of Grammar. For, no other Reaſon can be given of their Beginning with theſe Subtile and Abſtract things firſt. One would think, it ſhould ſeem to any conſidering man (as it ſeems to you) a reaſonable courſe, to proceed in that gradual, eaſie way ſpoken of. But ſeeing it is ſo general & ordinary a practice to Invert this Order, I think my ſomewhat prolix Diſcourſe of this matter, which ſeemed clear to you, is excuſable.

A. 'Tis plain enough, I think, that ſuppoſing the knowledge of Grammar to be Neceſſary, yet the Ordinary way of Teaching it, is Unnatural and Perverſe, and ſo muſt

muſt needs be Harſh and Vexing: and I ſay nothing of it. But one thing comes into my mind, perhaps not impertinent to be here mentioned. Whereas you ſpeak of an eaſy practical way of acquainting them with Grammar matters; you ſeem to intimate, that they, who will undertake this way of Teaching, muſt uſe ſome Grammar of their their own or others, ſuitable to this Method. Now perhaps it will not give ſatisfaction here in *England*, that the Scholar be made a Grammarian, unleſs he be made acquainted with Lillie's Grammar it ſelf. Which I think is a Book not ſo exactly fitted to this pleaſant practical Uſe; however it may be in other reſpects a perfect and compleat Grammar.

B. Not ſo compleat neither as ſome imagine. For before the *Oxford* Notes came forth upon it, there were defects enough in it; as will appear to any one, that ſhall read thoſe Notes. But with them, it is certainly a Compleat Grammar. Therefore I conceive that it will be convenient, to uſe Lillie's Grammar, not only to comply with the *Genius* of the Nation; and in Obedience to Authority, which commands the uſe of it; but becauſe of its own Fitneſs, Compleatneſs, and Sufficiency. But the Learners are to be brought to the Underſtanding and Uſe of it

Orderly

Orderly (as I intimated) and by Steps. I need not ſay much of this Gradual way, in the uſe of this Grammar particularly ; having ſaid ſo much of that matter already in the general. The Scholars, having learned to ſpeak by Uſe, and having acquired ſome Ability and Readineſs of writing as they ſpeak, are to be made acquainted with the Exemplary Rule, that is, the Eaſieſt Examples in the Accidence and Grammar and then to be led to the Abſtract Rule (as I called it) which is ordinarily called the Grammar Rule.

A. Is not this a retarding of them, to keep them ſo long from reading that which is to be their Rule afterwards?

B. I do not ſay, they ſhould be kept from Reading thoſe Examples. They are as fit as any thing elſe perhaps, to exerciſe their Reading, and memory too, if the Maſter pleaſe: But 'tis to no purpoſe, to trouble their heads with Grammar terms, or with Examining what they ſpeak or read by Grammar Rule (as 'tis call'd) until they have gotten ſome acquaintance and familiarity with the Tongue. And then to Examine what they ſpeak or Read, by the Example in the Grammar, will be no trouble at all. Nay I muſt needs ſay farther, that the Fundamental and moſt neceſſary Rules of Syntax

alſo

alſo, are ſo very Few, and very Eaſy; that they may be made acquainted with them almoſt as ſoon as with as with Examples themſelves. Though not before, nor without Examples, if they be never ſo eaſy. For the plaineſt Rule that can be, or any Grammar Term alone, is not ſo eaſily apprehended as an Example. So that they may be put to read thoſe things (ſome of them) from their very firſt beginning to ſpeak; but they are not to be troubled with the Grammatical Import of them till afterwards.

A. Which are thoſe Eaſy, Fundamental Rules of Syntax, that you make account are to be firſt learned, as preparatory to the other? And where have we theſe things of Grammar handled?

B. I mean thoſe that by *Sanctius* and ſuch as follow him, (as *Schioppius* and *Comenius*) are accounted the Foundation of the other. *Nebrixa* Tranſlated out of Spaniſh by Dr. *Hawkins* goes that way too, and *Voſſius* in his *Ariſtarchus*. There is now alſo publiſhed an Examination of the *Oxford* Grammar by the Ingenious Maſter of the School at *Newark*.

A. Why are theſe Rules to be firſt known before the other? And how doth the knowing of them firſt make way to the apprehending of the other?

B.

B. They are to be learned first, because (as I said) they are easier than the other. And chiefly, because they being first known, it is easy to conceive how in all other construction there is a figure, most commonly an Ellipsis as the *Oxford* Notes shew plainly; by which Notes also those Numerous and Intricate Rules are made Easy, (the Fundamental ones being known before) which without those Notes (which usually shew the Ellipsis, wherein lies the Reason of the Construction) are obscure and hardly Intelligible, and sometimes false.

A. The Grammar itself is by many judged too big. And if they must learn the notes besides, their Task will be still greater.

B. They are not to learn them by heart *Verbatim* after the Childish manner. But this is that which I speak of; that when they learn the Rule, they should take along with it the Note upon it; which is so far from being a burden to the Memory, or hard to be understood, that it makes the Rule itself Intelligible, and so by consequence more portable in memory.

A. Some Scruples I have still, concerning this Method. But at present my occasions call me away: and I doubt I have made somewhat bold with your time also. Therefore if you please, we will have farther

Speech

Speech of theſe matters anon in the Even-
ing.

B. Well. Let it be ſo.

DIALOGUE II.

The Advantages of this way of Teaching farther declared, and Objections anſwered.

A. B.

A. I Am ſatisfied, by what you have ſaid, that Boys of 7 or 8 years of Age, may be brought by uſe to a ready habit of ſpeaking Latine truly and properly, as well as they that are ſo taught from the cradle; that there is need of teaching them Grammar, notwithſtanding their learning by uſe, and alſo that great care ought to be taken, to lead them on in an eaſy, gradual, practical way; and you have ſhewed which is this way; and that it may be obſerved and kept, in the uſe of the ordinary

dinary Grammar; which Grammar you ſay is not compleat, without ſome ſuch explication as *Oxford* Notes; and therefore the Rules (when they are taught) muſt be taught with ſome ſuch explication. But if all this muſt be done, what gain of time is there, in learning by uſe? Doth not the ordinary way perfect them as ſoon?

B. All this way of proceeding being gradual, plain, and rational; the labour is not at all tedious or uneaſy. Now from the pleaſantneſs and eaſineſs you may well infer their gain of time. For he that hath eaſy ſhooes, on his feet, and a ſmooth way before him; as he will go with pleaſure, ſo he will perform his journey in far leſs time, than he could, if he had ſharp ſtones or thorns in his ſhooes, and his way rough or miry. He that takes pleaſure in his work, will diſpatch it with ſpeed.

A. It muſt needs be ſo.

B. Conſider alſo how quickly they go over their ſeveral ſtages, and you may gather how much time they may gain in the whole: Firſt, how ſoon do they attain a Readineſs, of ſpeaking; even in as ſhort a time as one learns a Tongue in a Forreign Country. How ſharp-ſighted is any one to perceive the meaning of an Author, when he knows the *Genius* and humour of the Tongue before hand; and conſe-

conſequently in how much leſs time may he learn any thing out of ſuch an Author than another can, who is more a ſtranger to the Tongue? And how eaſily, and conſequently how ſoon may one be brought to exerciſe his Pen in a Language that he can already ſpeak? 'Tis a great portion of time is gained (as the Author of *Examen* ſhews plainly) by a Childs learning Latine by uſe from Infancy. Now conſider, that a Boy, having firſt learned his Mother Tongue by uſe, if he be immediatly taken to be taught Latine this way, he will have learned both Tongues by uſe at the ſame age, that the other Child hath learned them both. Or if he be taken in hand after he can Read well (which is the beſt way) he will have learned to ſpeak and Read both tongues, at the ſame Age that the other will have learned to ſpeak and Read Both.

A. This ſeems Reaſonable to me.

B. You may hence alſo collect, that much time muſt needs be gained. Becauſe from their firſt beginning to ſpeak, there can be no moment of time loſt. For whenſoever they are from their Books, they can never be ſo idle, or ſo impertinently buſy, but their Latine buſineſs goes on. For at meals, or at play, being ſtill talking, they either gain new Words and Idioms, with their Maſters

inſpection,

inſpection, or at leaſt confirm their habit of ſpeaking, if they be but among themſelves.

A. Some will ſay (though indeed it is not my Judgment) that ſpeaking Latine Familiarly is a thing that they do not value. If my ſon, (one will ſay) underſtands an Author, and perform his Exerciſes well, I ſtand not upon it, whether he ſpeak Latine familiarly or no.

B. Such a Readineſs of ſpeaking is not only deſirable for it ſelf, and for converſe (on which account it is chiefly uſeful for them that intend to Travel;) but it is abſolutely Neceſſary to the removing of that Plaguy Tediouſneſs, Unpleaſantneſs, and Slavery, as well as ſlow Proficiency, that there is in all their Grammar buſineſs; ariſing chiefly from the want of this familiarity with the Tongue. This hath ſuch very great influence in making both Authors, Grammar itſelf, and all Exerciſes eaſie & pleaſant. Very many are the advantages enumerated by the Author of *Examen*, which that way of Teaching from Infancy hath above other Methods; moſt of wch being indeed not ſo peculiar to that way, but that this may lay juſt claim to them. I might here mention them. But you having read that Book I need not ſay any thing.

A. Seeing the Grammar Rules muſt be learned (as you acknowledge) and whenſoever

ſoever they be taken in hand, they will require ſome conſiderable time to be ſpent in them; they had better be learned at firſt than afterwards. But this Method, which ſuppoſes reading & writing true, to go before Grammar, caſts that a great way back, which they might better begin with; & ſo is neither eaſier nor ſhorter than the Methods in Uſe.

B. I ſaid indeed that it muſt needs be far the beſt way, that they firſt get this Ability of true writing both in Engliſh and Latine, and then be led to Grammar. But then remember, what it is, that I called leading them to Grammar: Namely, the Examining their own Speech, or what they read or write according to the Examples of Grammar, or the Fixt Rule, as I called it. That is, parſing by Example. This I called the beginning of Grammar with them. But becauſe they muſt be reading of ſomething, whilſt they are getting that ability of writing; & it may be their Reading is not perfect: Therefore they are employed in Reading of that Book. Not but that it is indifferent, what ſoever Book they perfect their Reading in. But ſeeing the Examples of that very Book are to be their Fixt Rule (as I called it) afterward; 'tis moſt convenient, it be that. So that in this Method they begin with Grammar, as ſoon as in any; if you

count

count the Reading a Grammar Book, to be Learning of Grammar. But I called the beginning to parſe by Example, the beginning of Grammar. For though it be the Grammar-Book, they read in before; yet they read it but as another Book, not as a Rule.

A. In the other Methods they are wont to put them to ſay the Grammar by heart; and that with good reaſon; becauſe, (as you ſay) 'tis to be afterwards their Rule; therefore unleſs in your Method they do that too; the others in the ordinary Method will be before them.

B. I am perſwaded, that getting of Spells by heart is very pernicious; but ſeeing the Latine Tongue will ſoon be alive; that is, familiar in their ordinary Speech; as ſoon as it begins to be ſo it is convenient, that they commit to memory, that which ſhall afterward be their Rule. So that they keep to the uſe of this Book, even from the firſt beginning; and yet keep to that particular point of the Method ſtill; the getting of a Readineſs of writing, before Grammar. They read it, to perfect their reading, if need be; and as ſoon as ever the Tongue begins to be alive, they commit it to memory; and whilſt they are doing this they get that Ability of writing true And then they come to Grammar, in the ſenſe that I ſpake

of. *i. e.* To uſe this as a Grammar, and a Rule (I mean, to Parſe or Examine Latine by it) which before they Read (but as they might have read another Book) to perfect Reading, and Exerciſe memory, and get words and Phraſes.

A. What you ſay is plain enough. But then why do you pretend, this is a differing Method from others? For they all put them at firſt to read (if their reading be imperfect) and then to ſay by heart, that which is afterward to be their Rule.

B. This Method differs not from others in that particular. But here lies the great difference. In the other, the Language being kept, dead all the time they are employed in getting the Grammar by heart; they con and thumb that Book, and read it, as ſomething in a Tongue which is not their own: Which makes their labour horridly unpleaſing, and tedious; and withal, what is ſo committed to memory, is uſeleſs, beſides the harm it doth to their underſtanding. Whereas in this way, the Tongue being preſently brought to life, and made their own Language, they can do any thing of that nature, with no more trouble, than one that underſtands Engliſh, commits an Engliſh Leſſon to memory.

A. Do you make account there is ſo great

great a difference, between Learning by heart a Leſſon in our own Tongue, and in a Language that is not our own.

B. No queſtion, but the getting any thing by heart, in a Tongue, ſo ſtrange as the Latine is to a Grammar Boy, is ten times more trouble, than Learning ſo much in one's Mother-Tongue. How much eaſier is it, to one that underſtands not Latine, to commit to memory a Chapter in the Engliſh Bible, than ſo much of the Grammar.. I know the Conſtruing-Book is ſome help; but nothing, in compariſon of knowing the Tongue Familiarly before. Let any man, who is a ſtranger to the Hebrew Tongue, (and can only read it) try, whether it be an eaſy pains, to commit to memory a page in the Hebrew Bible, though he have every word interpreted to him beforehand, by the Interlineary. The Boys caſe is the ſame, or worſe: For a mans parts are ſtronger than a Boy's; and he can better conquer his averſeneſs to that which is his buſineſs to do, by his Reaſon, than a Boy can, who is more under the power of his Inclination; and the dependence of the Bible is more coherent, than that of the Grammar. Hence judge, what a task they have

that are required, to get a Book of that bulk into their memory, whilſt Latine is a dead Tongue to them. But the great Labour is not all the miſchief. I am perſwaded it doth much harm to their parts, to make them Conn by heart a great Book full of hard words, for the moſt part without meaning, to them who do not know the Tongue familiarly. There is a two-fold exerciſe of memory. When they charge it with ſomething in a Tongue they know, and uſe familiarly; the mind attending to the ſenſe and dependence. This way of Exerciſe as 'tis pleaſant, ſo 'tis uſeful, to ſtrengthen the Rational memory. But to get by heart words and Articulate ſounds; whoſe meaning is unknown to them, (and the very ſound of the words too) and muſt be gotten, not by the minds attending to the meaning and coherence (which to them is none) but muſt be faſtened into the head, (as a nail into a Poſt) by often Repetition and Hammering; this I ſay (tho very ordinary) is not only tedious and vexing, but utterly uſeleſs alſo. For what is ſo gotten, only makes a Rumbling in their heads; and they Repeat it, as Witches (they ſay) do Charms, and 'tis good for nothing. (Thus Jack-daws and

Parrats

Parrats are taught words; and you ſee who they are that teach Boys to ſpeak like Parrats.) And it were well, if it only did no good: But moreover, 'tis hurtful to that Memory which is Rational and Manly. Commonly they that are dull of Apprehenſion, are good at this kind of Memory: And contrarily good Wits are moſt impatient of having their Memories exerciſed in this brutiſh way; and if they be forced to it, their Parts are thereby weakened and ſtupified. Therefore they had need have a good familiar acquaintance with the Tongue beforehand, and make it a Living Language, as much as may be, to avoid the miſchief of that Magpy-memory, which tends but to the foundering of their Wits, and the bejading of their Underſtandings. But the familiar Uſe of the Tongue, before they commit the Grammar to memory, is a conſiderable gain of Time alſo, in this very buſineſs of Grammar. (How it is ſo in other reſpects, we have ſeen before.) For one that hath Latine as his Vernacle Tougue, (as he underſtands what he Reads more clearly than another, and commits it to memory with much more eaſe than he that is a ſtranger to Latine, as they are who learn the Grammar by heart the other way) ſo he muſt needs do it in far leſs time:

Even as one that hath the Engliſh Tongue, and wants the Latine, would ſooner get by heart an Engliſh Book of the ſame bigneſs with the Latine Grammar, than the Grammar it ſelf. In ſhort, they begin the Grammar-Book in this method, as ſoon as in any whatſoever (you have heard how) and will have learned it with underſtanding, and become Grammarians (having the Tongue familiar and living) ſooner than they can in any other.

A. Many make this Objection, and triumph in it, as unanſwerable. And though I am not of their mind, yet I will urge their Argument as forcibly as I can. Speaking Latine familiarly (ſay they) doth not make one to underſtand the Grammar-Rules the better; therefore 'tis an uſeleſs thing, and of no value.

B. How? Uſeleſs? Ready Speaking enableth us to make known our thoughts to others that underſtand the ſame Tongue, and to underſtand their meaning ſpeaking to us. We have ſeen alſo, that with ſome Exerciſe of Writing, one that hath not learned Grammar, will be able to commit his own thoughts to writing. And Latin thus learned, enableth us to underſtand what we read. So that without that which they call the Grammar-Rules it may be an Inſtrument of communicating thoughts,

thoughts, both in ſpeaking and writing. And what further uſe is there of a Language? Therefore thus much knowledge of the Tongue is not uſeleſs; though to have the knowledge of the Grammar beſides is better.

A. Can one that hath not the Rules underſtand an Author?

B. Are there not thouſands in *England*, that can read a Latine Author with underſtanding, who will tell you, they have forgotten their Grammar-Rules?

A. They did once underſtand them, and by them underſtood the Tongue; and now keep the Tongue though they do not remember the Rules.

B. Whether it be ſo or no, we ſhall ſee by and by But I ask again, Were there not thouſands (think you) in *Rome* and elſewhere in the Empire, that could read a Latine Book with underſtanding, who never were taught any ſuch Grammar-Rules as you ſpeak of? And will not theſe having learned Latine by Uſe as they, underſtand alſo a Book as they did? Is not this caſe the ſame?

A. No, The Latine was their natural Tongue (ſome will ſay) as Engliſh is ours; & therefore they could read a Latine Book and underſtand it, as we do an Engliſh one; but the Latine is not ſo natural (they make account) to theſe Learners.

B. No

B. No one Tongue is more natural to any man than another (though ſome have had a conceit that the Hebrew is natural to every one.) But whereas Latine was their National Language; ſeeing theſe Learners will have it as familiar as if it were National, and their Vernacle; there is good ground to think theſe will underſtand a Book as they did, without any knowledge of Grammar. You know what is ſaid of the *French* Child's reading of *Phædro*. I have known one of the Female Sex, who learned ſomething of the Latine Tongue by Uſe, together with her Engliſh, from Infancy; but after the fourth or fifth year of her age, had no more occaſion to uſe it familiarly, not living with any who talked with her. She never learned ſo much as to Read Latine, nor ever read ſix Leaves (I think) of any Latine Book in the world: And now, being at Womans eſtate, underſtands any thing ſhe hears another read in a Collocutory or an Epiſtolary ſtyle, as *Beza*'s or *Caſtalio*'s Tranſlation of the New Teſtament or the like, and can correct a young Grammarian when he ſtumbles upon Soloeciſms or Barbariſms, though ſhe never had any deſign or thought of keeping what ſhe learned in her childhood, nor ever minded any ſuch thing as Latine; nor ever knew any

Exam. p. 48.

thing

thing of that which they call a Grammar-Rule, no more than my Grandam's Cat. So great a thing is familiar Uſe to the underſtanding of a Book. Now if one that had Uſe in this low degree, can do this without any care at all, they that have a more confirm'd Habit will do better.

A. It may be as you ſay, that one who hath not learned Grammar-Rules, may underſtand an Author; yet tis neceſſary to underſtand the Rule (ſay they again.)

B. I do not deny it; nay, I have proved it.

A. Well then, doth ſpeaking Latine familiarly help to underſtand the Rule the better, or the ſooner? This is the Queſtion they require an Anſwer to.

B. That I may give a right and full Anſwer, I muſt ask firſt, What is a Rule? Do not they call that the Rule of our Speech, according to which we do, and ought to frame our Speech?

A. Yes; What elſe can any body mean by a Rule of Speech?

B. But we have ſeen already, that Example is that, according to which we frame our Speech: Chiefly indeed the Living Example, when we hear one ſpeak *viva voce*. Though this Example may be repreſented to our Eye, in an Author, or in the

he Grammar-book it ſelf. To give you an Anſwer then to your Queſtion, I ſay, True Example is the Rule, according to which we do, and ought to frame our Speech: But by ſpeaking true Latine familiarly, we learn the better, and the ſooner to underſtand a true Example: Therefore by ſpeaking Latine familiarly, we learn to underſtand our Rule the ſooner, and the better.

A. It cannot be denyed (I think) that Example is a Rule. And it is as plain that ſpeaking muſt needs be helpful to underſtand an Example: But they that make this Objection, mean, that ſpeaking Latine doth not help to the underſtanding of that which you called (ſignificantly enough, I think) the Abſtract Rule: That is ordinarily called the Grammar-Rule; and 'tis neceſſary to underſtand that. Therefore is ſpeaking Latine helpful to the underſtanding of thoſe Grammar-Rules? This is their Queſtion.

B. How neceſſary it is to know them, we have ſeen already. Not to the acquiring a Habit of ſpeaking, or an Ability of writing true Latin, or to the underſtanding of an Author; For all theſe ends are attained by other means; as we have ſeen. Yet I have granted, and ſhewn too, that they are uſeful

ſeful to another purpoſe. But iet me ask ou, or any that make the Objection, Why do you or they think it neceſſa- y, that theſe Rules ſhould be under- ſtood?

A. Becauſe they are Rules.

B. But I have ſhewed (nay you have aid it your ſelf) that Example is the Rule, y which we know that we ſpeak right, and y which we learn to ſpeak right, and to rite true Latin, and to diſtinguiſh between rue and falſe Latine. Therefore they that know the Example, are not without a Rule o all theſe purpoſes, though they underſtand not any other Rules.

A. Tho a true Example be a Rule, yet it would do well that they ſhould underſtand theſe Rules beſides.

B. Doubtleſs it would do no harm. Nay they ought to be learned. But to the Ends mentioned, there is not that abſolute neceſ- ſity of them. But ſeeing that ſpeaking Latine helps to the underſtanding of the clearer Rule, as we have ſeen; what if it doth not help to the underſtanding of theſe obſcure and abſtruſe Rules?

A. Is Example a clearer Rule than that which we call the Grammar- Rule?

B. Judge you. Will not a young Lear- ner

ner more readily conceive that *Equus currit* the Horſe runs, is true Latine, becauſe it is like *Præceptor legit*; than if you tell him firſt that the Nominative Caſe goeth before the Verb, and then that a Verb perſonal agreeth with his Nominative caſe in Number and perſon? Or will he not more eaſily perceive, that *Tu & frater ludis*, you and your Brother are at play, is like *Tu & pater periclitamini*, Thou and thy Father are in danger; than he can apprehend that Rule; Many Nominative Caſes ſingular, with a Conjunction Copulative coming between them will have a Verb Plural, which Verb Plural ſhall agree with the Nominative Caſe of the moſt worthy perſon? Is it not eaſier to conceive that ſplendor *auri*, the Shining of the Gold, is like *amor nummi*, the love of Money; than that rule (which is counted the eaſieſt of all to the Boys) when Two Subſtantives come together betokening divers things the latter ſhall be the Genitive caſe? Nay, might not a teacher talk himſelf hoarſe about any Rule in Grammar, if he ſhould not explain it by an Example; and never be underſtood by his Scholars?

A. That's true; they do not underſtand ſuch Rules by themſelves, but firſt they underſtand the Examples, and that brings them

hem to apprehend the meaning of the Rule.

B. Now then you have granted, what ou put me upon proving; that the Exam-le is the clearer; and moreover, that the Rule cannot be underſtood but by the Example. Then (briefly to ſum up what ath been ſaid) ſpeaking Latine makes us he more eaſily to underſtand the Exam-le, which is the cleareſt Rule and without which the other Rule cannot be underſtood. Therefore ſpeaking Latine helps to the nderſtanding of the Other Rule it ſelf.

A. But there are thoſe, who will never grant that ſpeaking Latine helps to under-ſtand the Rules. For many can ſpeak Latine, and that true, who cannot under-ſtand the Rules; and many underſtand them, and yet are ſlow at ſpeaking.

A. You do well to deny the Con-cluſion, when you have granted the Premiſ-ſes.

A. It may be (they'l ſay) ſpeaking Latine doth not help to the underſtanding of the Example it ſelf.

B. You have granted it all this while. But if you had not, we ſee, that a Child of of Four or Five years old will Speak true; as that Child at *Paris*; and I have known others, (and ſo have you) who could ſpeak

Grammatically

Grammatically, and yet never learned so much as to Read any Rule in Grammar. Therefore all these have understood the Example: I mean the living Example; that is, what they have heard spoken. They understood it so far, as to make it their Rule of speaking, or to frame their speech according to it.

A. But this is not the Book-Example.

B. That is it which I have been saying all this while, *viz.* that the Living Example, or what is spoken in familiar Talk, is the cleareſt, and moſt eaſily imitable. But the Example in the Book being the ſame (onely leſs imitable, because more dead) it appears, that speaking familiarly helps to apprehend firſt the Living Example, then the Dead one, or Exemplary Rule in the Book, and ſo the Rule it ſelf, as 'tis called. And ſo you have an Anſwer; and you ſee how ſpeaking Latine helps to the underſtanding of thoſe Rules of Grammar Art.

A. If this be the way to come to the underſtanding of them, how come they to the knowledge of the Rules, who have not the Advantage of the Living Rule, as you called it? Or who have not heard Latine familiarly uſed, nor have learned the lively uſe of it themſelves?

B. The

B. They get that knowledge by the Dead Example in the Book, and therefore not without very great labour and difficulty. And the greater number after all their pains, do neither attain to the knowledge of those Rules, nor of the Latine Tongue; as we see daily by sad Experience.

A. I ask again, how it comes to pass that many who understand these Rules well, are slow and unready at speaking or writing?

B. The cause of that is apparent, *viz.* the want of the Living Use of the Tongue in familiar Talk, of which enough hath been said already.

A. How comes it to pass on the other side, that some understand the Tongue, and some can also speak grammatically and properly, who either never learned these Rules, or have forgotten them?

B. Because they speak by Example (either the living, or the Book-Example) which we have shewed over and over, to be the Rule. Whereas indeed that which they ordinarily call the Grammar Rule, is no Rule of speaking; at least we do not practically make it so. For (as I said before) that by which we frame our Speech, and which we Imitate,

is our Rule. But we do not Imitate that which we call the Grammar-Rule, but the Example; and that they have not forgotten, who forget the other.

A. Though we do not Imitate that Rule; yet we ſpeak according to it.

B. We ſpeak by the Example; and if the Rule (as you call it) be according to the Example, then it happens that our Speech is according to that Rule. But if the Rule (called ſo) be not according to the Example (as it is not when it tells us, the Governed word is governed of that, of which it is not governed) then we ſpeak by a right Rule, that is, a right Example; but it is not according to the Grammar Rule (ſo called) becauſe that is falſe, or at leaſt faulty and defective.

A. Explain your meaning more clearly.

B. Inſtances will make my meaning plain; *Aurum eſt ponderoſiſſimum metallorum*, is true Latine according to that Example in the Accidence, *Cicero eſt eloquentiſſimus oratorum*. But the Rule tells us, the Genitive Plural is governed of the Superlative put partitively;

whereas

whereas it is governed of *è numero*, ſuppreſſed by an Ellipſis ; Therefore though it be according to the Example, yet 'tis not according to that which you call the Rule ; which is falſe. *Accuſat me furti*, is true Latine, and may be ſafely Imitated as a Rule. But the Rule (as you call it) which tells us that *furti* is governed of the Verb, (whereas in truth, there is an Ellipſis of the governing word *crimine*) is falſe. Once more ; *Fama pretioſior Gemmis*, is true Latine, and according to the Example, *Aurum eſt vilius virtutibus*. But not according to the Rule, which tells us that the Ablative is governed of the Adjective Comparative, whereas 'tis governed of the Prepoſition *præ* ſuppreſſed.

A. Theſe inſtances make your meaning plain enough, But what do you infer from this defect in ſuch Rules? That they are not to be learned?

B. I infer hence, that when they are learned, they are to be made both true and intelligible, by ſhewing the Ellipſis, as is done in *Oxford* Grammar, of which thing we ſpake enough before. For to burden the memory with that which can-

not be understood, or to entertain an error or falshood, with a conceit that 'tis truth; is but folly. It appears then, that they are not Rules properly (for it is not by them that we Regulate our speech, but by the Examples) But they are Observations onely. For the Grammarians (forsooth) observing in 1000 Instances or Examples, that that was the way of speaking, lay down their observations, as Rules ; which are indeed sometimes true ; but sometimes false, sometimes defective, and oftentimes Superfluous.

A. If these observations, (as you will call them) are sometimes false ; how is it, that they, who speak and write Latine by these, speak and write true Grammar ? For no body can speak and write true by a false or faulty Rule.

B. This still shews the truth of what I have so often said, *viz.* That they who write and speak true, do not write and speak by these Observations, but by the Example, (as their Rule,) and that is always true, and safe to be imitated. And now you may perceive, how it comes to pass, that many, who know true Latine from false, yet will tell you, they have forgotten

gotten the Rules. Indeed they have forgotten theſe obſervations of the Grammarians but they have not forgotten that which was to them a Rule ; that is, Example. If they had, they would have forgotten the Latine Tongue itſelf.

A. Many know true Latine from falſe, who have forgotten both Rule and Example of Grammar.

B. That may be ; but then they have read or heard 1000 Examples ſomewhere, at ſome time; of all which they have ſo much remembrance, that they are a Rule to them. Juſt as any one that hears this or any other Language ſpoken, Speaks like them whom he hears ; and ſo their Speech is to him a Rule of his Speech ; though he doth not remember the particular Inſtance, that he Imitates, when he ſpeaks.

A. I think you have ſaid ſo much of this matter, as may ſatisfy any man.

B. I may not conveniently leave it, until I have mentioned one thing more. They that complain the Grammar is ſo hard and crabbed a thing, may ſee what it is, that makes it to be ſo. Thoſe obſervations, (which they call Rules) are falſe

or otherwiſe faulty, and that makes them difficult to be apprehended. Again they did not learn them orderly (the Fundamental and plain ones firſt, and the other after them) but all in confuſion. Now whatſoever is either falſe, or is learned out of order, is hard to be apprehended; whereas that which is true, and is orderly Learned, is plain and perſpicuous, and alſo eaſily retained. What this true order is, we have ſpoken before. What I ſay of Rules, I may ſay alſo of Grammar-Terms; that they are far harder to be apprehended, than the Examples in the Introduction ; and therefore young Learners (and I think any other) had better be taught the Examples, not puzzling their heads too much with thoſe ſubtile terms, (though it may be no inconvenience to get them into the memory.) As for inſtance, A Boy will eaſily apprehend that *ambulaverunt*, they walked or have walked, is like *Amaverunt*, they loved or have loved (for ſo it ſhould be Engliſhed in the Accidence) whereas it would be ſome trouble to him, to comprehend at once all the tattles, that they uſe in Examining ſuch a word ; and tell you, that it is the third perſon Plural of the Preterperfect Tenſe of the Indicative mood, though afterward that will not be hard neither. Upon the whole, you may perceive, that

that your Objection, which ſeemed to have ſuch weight in it, was grounded upon theſe miſtakes; That there is no other Rule of our Speech, than that which is commonly called the Grammar Rule; and therefore if that Rule be not underſtood, he that ſpeaks, or reads, or writes Latine, hath no Rule. Whereas 'tis moſt certain, that never any one in the world did learn Latine by them; but contrarily, the Scholar learns them by Latine; that is, by help of the Example: Neither were they ever the immediate Rule of any Man's (much leſs of any Boys) ſpeech. Another miſtake, which this Objection is grounded upon, is this: That unleſs ſpeaking Latine familiarly can inſpire them with a power of conceiving things above the apprehenſion of ſome ſort of wits; it is not advantageous to any purpoſe at all. Whereas 'tis poſſible (yea very ordinarily it happens) that ſome, who are too young, and others, who are too Clumzy-pated, to apprehend ſome of the Grammar Terms and Rules (as they are commonly called) may be of capacity notwithſtanding, to learn the Latine Tongue, and that by Rule; that is, by Example. Again, the Objectors take it for granted and ſuppoſed; that they who begin to teach with familiar ſpeaking, do only teach them to Talk, and no more; becauſe

perhaps ſome that have undertaken to teach ſo, have done no more. And therefore becauſe familiar ſpeaking, (without reading or writing or any exerciſe) doth not immediately enable them to apprehend the ſubtileſt Terms and Rules of Grammar Art (whether true or falſe) they conclude, that it is all unprofitable, and to no purpoſe at all. Whereas none but a madman will ſay that ſpeaking Latine can give any perſon that ſubtility of underſtanding, which Nature never endowed him with. The Teachers, that uſe this way, do only aſſert it to be an eaſy, natural, certain, ſhort Method, for ſuch reaſons, and on ſuch Grounds, as we have been ſpeaking of. And it hath been the purpoſe of all our diſcourſe, to ſhew how uſeful this way of beginning with Uſe is: what is to be done, beſides teaching them to ſpeak familiarly; and in what order; and how it is to be carried on. Yet though ſpeaking Latine doth not endow the learner with ſuch a ſubtil apprehenſion, as was juſt now ſpoken of, yet I ſay the right Method in which they are taught Grammar, makes the ſubtileſt things therein to be more eaſily and clearly apprehended, than they can be, being taught in a wrong and confuſed way. And they that have complained ſo grievouſly of the hardneſs of their Gram-

mar

mar-task, may know that it would not have been ſo harſh and difficult to them, had the Rules themſelves (as they call them) been Regulated, as now they are, by a better ſort of Grammarians.

A. Hitherto I have, with all the force and skill I was able, managed their Objection, who cannot conceive, but that the knowledge of the artificial Rule is abſolutely neceſſary to the gaining of the Tongue: and I think you have ſaid enough to ſatisfy any ſuch Objector. But now (to ſpeak my own mind and ſenſe;) If ſuch Obſervations digeſted into Method in ſome Syſtem or Book of Grammatical Inſtitution, and are ordinarily called Rules, be no more neceſſary than you have ſhewed, that is, not to the getting an ability of ſpeaking or writing Latine; and are not by any learner, practically, and as to Uſe, made his Rule; and therefore are not Rules, but in a very remote and improper ſenſe: What need is there of learning ſuch a Book of Grammar Rules. Is not this meer Trifling and miſpending of time?

B. As we commonly get a practical ſkill in other Arts and Sciences, by Uſe, and yet do not think it a ſuperfluous labour

bour to learn Syſtems, and Inſtitutions of them: So 'tis in the Grammar Art. Every man in ſome meaſure underſtands ſenſe, and hath ſome Faculty of Reaſoning by Nature; which is Improved by Uſe, in ſome more, in ſome leſs; and yet, we count it a part of needfull Education, to learn the Dialectick Art Syſtematically, and according to ſome Methodical Book. Many by Uſe attain ſome Ability of ſpeaking Elegantly and Ornately; and Example is to ſuch a Rule of ſpeaking Elegantly; And yet 'tis not looked upon as an uſeleſs and ſuperfluous thing, to learn the Art of Rhetorick, according to ſome Syſtem. The like may be ſaid of many other Sciences of the Encyclopædia. And the caſe is the ſame in the buſineſs of Grammar. Therefore 'tis no more ſuperfluous beſides Uſe, to learn Inſtitutions of Grammar Methodically Digeſted, than to learn Logick or Rhetorick Syſtematically. Yet on the other ſide it would be as much againſt both Reaſon and Experience, to ſay there is no poſſibility of Speaking Grammatically without learning ſome Book of Grammaticall Inſtitutions by heart; as to aſſert that no man can Uſe Tropes and other Rhetorical Ornaments in his ſpeech, without

out getting by heart ſome Book of Rhetorical Inſtitutions: Or that no man can ſpeak Senſe, or know whether another argues Rationally, unleſs he have read Logick, and throughly learned and digeſted *Ariſtotle*'s Organon.

A. I acquieſce in what you ſay, and conceive the caſe of Grammar to be the ſame with other Arts or Sciences. And (to ſpeak plainly) from what you have ſaid, I cannot but conceive, that the only way to learn the Art of Grammar (which they call the Grammar-Rules) in order, with eaſe and pleaſure, and in a little time to underſtand them clearly, and to be able to make the beſt uſe of them, is according to this lively Method, to bring the Tongue to Life firſt in the mouth of the Learner, by the Living Example in the mouth of the Teacher, and then to go on in the Order laid down. And I ſee the Gygantick Objection is vanquiſhed, and vaniſheth into Air. But Experience is an Objection too ſtrong for all ſeeming Reaſons. What ſay you to them, that urge the miſcarriage of many; (if not of all) that have been taught in this Method?

B. Many (they ſay) who have been taught

taught by uſe firſt, either from the Cradle or from more advanced years, (for the caſe is the ſame) have miſcarried. Now the reaſon of their falling ſhort of what was deſigned, may be gathered from what hath been ſaid, concerning the neceſſity of the Living, and moſt eaſily Imitable Rule firſt; and then the Ability of true writing; with the Fixt Exemplary Rule, before the more ſubtile Terms, and Abſtract Rules; which are not practically to any man the Rule of his Speech. I ſay hence appears the cauſe of the Miſcarriage of ſuch. For their Maſters after they had been taught by familiar Speech, have not led them on in this Natural, Eaſy, Pleaſant Way; but contrarily. Here was the defect of *Mountain*'s Maſters, ſo far as may be collected from what he ſaith of himſelf. They that taught him to ſpeak, did not lead him forward (whatever was the matter) in ſuch an even and fair path, as he had hitherto been uſed to. That is, they did not bring him on to an Ability of writing true as he could ſpeak (which is *Quintilians facultas ſcribendi*) and ſo to the Fixt Example, or Exemplary and true Rule, but were at a ſtand: Which thing his Father perceiving, and being now at a loſs, what o do with him next, ſent him to a publick

lick School; where being taught no otherwiſe than the reſt of the Scholars, that is, not in this natural, practical way, but by ſubtile and perplext Rules; the Event was no better than he tells us in his Eſſays. I know not what was wrought afterward upon the Child at *Paris*, which which was the occaſion of writing the *Examen*; or that at *London* ſo talked of a few years ſince. But I believe, if ſuch as have been taught by Uſe, either from the Cradle, or from any other Age, have not made progreſs afterwards, according to their fair and promiſing beginnings, the Reaſon is the ſame which hath been now named. And if any have held on throughout to compleatneſs; they have done ſo, by holding to this way. Therefore it is unjuſtly objected againſt this Method, that ſome, who have begun by Uſe, have miſcarried: Becauſe their Error was not their beginning by uſe; but that having begun ſo they did not hold on in this natural and ſmooth way, but deviating from it, fell into the common Method and ſo came off no better than others. So that they cannot be ſaid to miſcarry in this Method, but becauſe they did not keep in it.

A. You have ſhewed, that this is the Way of the Romans with their Children, at

at leaſt ſo far as concerns a readineſs of true Writing, before Grammar. Therefore any Inſtance of miſcarriage they can bring, makes nothing againſt your Method, (as I conceive) unleſs they can Inſtance in ſome Roman Child, that hath miſcarried. But there is another Objection ordinarily made. I know not indeed, whether it be another, or the ſame in other words. But ſuch as it is, take it, and anſwer it, if you can; or if you think it worth anſwering. Speaking by Uſe is but prating like a Parrat. Therefore they muſt learn by their Grammar, or elſe they had as good do nothing.

B. Though enough hath been ſaid already to ſhew the vanity of this Objection; yet ſomething more muſt be ſaid to it, becauſe many think it very weighty. I would ask ſuch an Objection-monger, what it is to ſpeak like a Parrat? Is it not to frame words, whereof he that ſpeaks knows not the meaning? Well then, doth he that ſpeaks by uſe alone, not know what he himſelf ſays? If all that ſpeak by uſe alone prate like Parrats and Jack-daws; then all the men in *England* that have not learned the Grammar of the Engliſh Tongue, ſpeak like Parrats, and know not what they themſelves ſay, neither do they underſtand the meanin

meaning of their own words. And they ſpeak like Parrats too, that made this wiſe Objection. But indeed they ſpeak worſe than Parrats. For though a Parrat knows not the meaning of the words that it ſounds; yet they that hear them, know the ſenſe of thoſe words, but theſe Objectors prate that which neither themſelves can underſtand, nor any body elſe, that is, juſt nonſenſe. But in the concluſion of their objection, they would fain ſhew their meaning by their gaping. They would ſay, I ſuppoſe that it is better to learn by Grammar than by uſe alone, without Grammar. But is it better to learn by Grammar alone, than by uſe and Grammar both? Or is this their meaning? That unleſs one learn Grammar, he cannot ſpeak true Latine? If ſo, I have ſhewed, and the Author of *Examen* ſhews, that one may ſpeak true Latine by uſe alone. And I may further prove it: Becauſe once there was a City far bigger than *London*, where they all ſpake Latine, as true as they ſpeak Engliſh now at *London*: And did they all learn to ſpeak by their Grammar and Conſtruing Book? Or is this their meaning (if they mean any thing) That Learning to ſpeak by uſe is a hindrance to the learning of Grammar? If they mean ſo they have had their anſwer already. For

it

it hath been ſhewed, that the learning by Uſe, is ſo far from being a hindrance, that it is the greateſt help to the learning the Grammar, if they go the right way to work. Uſe is not contrary, but ſubſervient to the learning of Grammar.

A. This is ſufficiently ſhewn already.

B. Therefore, when ſuch a wiſe Queſtion is put (as ordinarily it is) whether it be better to learn by uſe or by Grammar? It is as if one ſhould ask, whether it be better, for a Taylor to ſtitch with his fingers or with his needle? The anſwer to the Queſtion is, 'Tis beſt both to learn to ſpeak by uſe, and to learn Grammar; but not to learn the Grammar-Art before uſe, but in that order before ſpoken of, and for the reaſons already mentioned. I have ſaid more in anſwer to this ſleeveleſs objection than it may ſeem to require or deſerve, becauſe of the great confidence they put in it. Some Wiſeakers, when they have but named the Parrat, think they have brought an Irrefragable Argument againſt this way. Though they know not their own meaning. But we have ſeen before, what Method is more juſtly charged with that fault.

A. How

A. How easy, short and certain soever this way be, yet what need we leave the ordinary Mothod for any other? Many attain the Tongue to compleatness the usuall way. Have we not most learned men in all Faculties who had their first Education in no other way? And can it be supposed that the Learning Latine an Easier way than ordinary will make them more Learned men at last?

B. Though many have gotten the Tongue so, yet the far greater Number have miscarried, and do daily miscarry.

A. That may arise from other Causes, not from any Defect in the Method.

B. That it is not through defect of Wit or Parts ordinarily, but through the faultiness of the Method in which they were taught, appears hence, that they who could not get skill in the Latine Longue in that way, have been capable enough of other points of Learning. And as for those that have done so laudably in that harsh and intricate Method, no thanks to the Method, but to their Ingeny, Industry and patience.

how much better would they have done in a plain and Easy one? A Nag that can perform his journey, taking all Hedges, and Ditches in his way; how gallantly would he have done it in a smooth and open Road. And indeed I make account, that to attain to a compleat skill in the Latin Tongue, is but a kind of Disappointment and miscarriage when gotten with such pains and Expence of Time, and Dulling of Mind, and slavish Usage, with other Inconveniences, which necessarily accompany the Usual Method arising from this spring amongst others, *viz.* The perverse Teaching of Things first, especially the Tongue being dead, and the Learners young, and of tender minds and slow apprehensions. If one being desirous to get to the Top of the Ladder quickly should attempt to set his foot upon the highest round at the first step; instead of climbing he would be more like to lay himself on his back.

A. If nothing else could be said against this way; yet the very newness of it is enough to render it suspected. This way that is only approved of by some few of late, is not like to be better than that which hath been Universally used in all Schools so long a time.

B. If

B. If the Usual way were apparently Good, there would be ground to suspect that another very different from it were naught. But seeing that is so Bad, as the Loud and too well known complaints (which I need not stand to reckon up) do speak it to be, 'tis a probable argument, that a Method that recedes far from it is good. But you have heard better proofs of its goodness. But indeed that which is accounted the Old way is but new, and this Old. Have we not seen how agreeable it is to the way that the *Romans* used in teaching their Children both the Latine and Greek Tongues? Nay, is it not as old as the Latine Tongue itself? yea, as the World? For have not all men, of all Nations, in all ages, learned their own National Tongue by Use?

A. But this is not National, and therefore 'tis doubted the same way of use would not have so good success.

B. Have not I said enough to take away this suspicion?

A. In my judgement you have.

B. Can we hope to find a better way tha. that in which all Languages on Earth are

Learned, which is Uſe? And that in which this was Learned, when it was National which was Uſe. Do not all men learn a foreing ſpeech by Uſe, if they have Opportunity? And what is it but the want of ſuch Opportunity, that hath brought the other Dead way into uſe? Whilſt Latine was a living Language, every one learned it by uſe. But when it became dead, they were forced to take ſuch a courſe to get it, as they could by Books only. And this hath continued ſo long, that it is now counted the Old way of teaching. Whereas Uſe is not indeed a new way, but a very old one revived, or the general way of learning all Tongues, applyed particularly to the Latine.

A. For my own part, I have not any thing more to Object, being convinced that this is far better than the other Lifeleſs way by Books only. And I conceive, it is a thing fit to be conſidered by parents and Guardians. Here I call to mind a paſſage in the *Examen* which I cannot but make reflection upon. That Author ſo far approves of the way uſed in Teaching of the French Child, that he wonders, all the World do not take the ſame courſe. Now you having made it out ſo fully, that this is not Inferiour to that in the Beginning of it; and ha

in

ing ſhewed plainly, how it may and ought to be carryed on, though I will not ſay, that I ſhall wonder, if all the World will not; yet I conceive, that ſome of more diſcretion than the unthinking Many, would chooſe this way of Educating their Children; were they but awakened to conſider it, by ſuch Reaſons as you have given.

B. Then I think I have ſaid enough to your firſt doubt. Whether the Latine Tongue may be Learned by Uſe. I have ſhewed that it may be done, and How. Shall I proceed now to your other enquiry? Whether it may be done at any Tolerable Charge?

A. No, no. I'le ſpare you that labour. For I think it will not be hard, for any man, to give himſelf an anſwer, as to that Enquiry; if he do but well weigh, what you have ſaid in anſwer to the former. For here will be no need of ſuch a huge charge as I dreamed of, and the Modellers ſpeak of. Here is required no ſuch thing, as the Erecting of a Latine *Canobium*, or of putting together a Company of men able in that Language, to make a little Republick, by Order of ſome potent Monarch; nor of the founding of Glottick Societies, with Salaries and Stipends,

Governors, Officers, Teach
Servants. A far leſs Charge and *Apparatus* w
do the buſineſs. Therefore let others, w
have more occaſion to think of it, and wh
are better at it than I, contrive a Model.
hope the thoughts of that matter will no
break my ſleep to night.

B. Nor mine.

FINIS.